

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brumelow et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,119,104 ("Brumelow"). In response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 9, 15, 21, 22, 26, 28 and 30 and canceled claim 5.

Independent claims 1, 15 and 26 as amended recite an application environment, computer program product and method (respectively) for providing an integrated application environment. Each of these claims includes an element comprising a centralized store of information, or, equivalently, a desktop bus, that provides a stored key to an application responsive to a pre-specified event. This feature was cited in original claim 15 and dependent claim 5.

15. A computer program product comprising:
- a computer-usable medium having computer-readable code embodied therein for providing an integrated application environment, the computer-readable code comprising:
 - a desktop bus module for receiving a key, the key identifying customer data accessible from a remote computer system, storing the key, and **providing the key to an application program responsive to an occurrence of a pre-specified event; and**
 - a bus interface module for enabling communications between the application program and the desktop bus module, the bus interface module adapted to provide the key to the desktop bus module and receive the key from the desktop bus module.

Thus, provision is made in claims 1, 15 and 26 for providing a key identifying customer data to an application program upon the occurrence of some pre-specified event, such as the bus receiving a key from another application or the application gaining focus. This claim element

allows multiple applications executing on a single client computer to be synchronized, so that each application displays information about the same customer. This feature allows a user working on the client computer to view information about the same customer across all (or a subset) of the applications executing on the client. The user does not need to worry that certain ones of the applications are displaying "stale" information, e.g., information about a different customer identified by a different key.

Brumbelow discloses a middleware layer of object-oriented software routines (the "platform" of objects) that allows modern applications ("functional desktops") to converse with legacy routines and a database running on a mainframe. However, Brumbelow does not address the problem of keeping multiple applications synchronized, and does not disclose the feature of sending a key from a bus to an application in response to an occurrence of a pre-specified event.

Examiner refers to column 3, lines 1-9 of Brumbelow, which discuss various functional desktops using the customer object, so that "each desktop has all the customer information available..." The objects access an object database that allows the objects to "compile and share information apart from the mainframe database and application programs." This teaching differs from providing a key to an application program upon the occurrence of a pre-specified event. In the absence of this capability, the Brumbelow system cannot, for example, enable applications to update displayed information in response to a user-initiated change of customer in another application.

Thus, Brumbelow neither teaches nor suggests the claimed features. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that a person of ordinary skill in the art, considering the teachings of Brumbelow, would not find the claimed invention obvious.

Dependent claims 7, 9, 21, 22, 30, and 32 recite further details of the pre-specified event and Applicant respectfully submits that the features of these claims are not found in Brumbelow. Further, claims 13 and 23 recite using color to indicate which of a plurality of sessions identified by a customer key is active. The portion of Brumbelow relied upon by the Examiner to recite these claims (col. 7, lines 13-33) does not discuss using color as claimed and Applicant submits that the claimed features would not be obvious to a person of ordinary skill. Applicant submits that the dependent claims not specifically mentioned above are patentable at least due to the features of their respective base claims.

In summary, based on the above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-4 and 6-33 are patentably distinguishable over Brumbelow and requests that this application be passed to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to advance the prosecution of this application.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that all of the stated grounds of objection and rejection set forth by the Examiner in the Office Action have been properly accommodated or addressed. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and withdraw them. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if it is felt that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted
Dennis J. Nasrawi

Date: 21 MARCH 2005

By: 

David K. Varn
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 53,718
FENWICK & WEST LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94306
(650) 335-7183
dvarn@fenwick.com